arXiv:1410.4045v1 [math.LO] 15 Oct 2014

Group construction in non-trivial geometric C-minimal structures.

F. Delon and F. Maalouf

Abstract

We show that an infinite group is definable in any non trivial geometric C-minimal structure which is definably maximal and does not have any definable bijection between a bounded interval and an unbounded one in its canonical tree. No kind of linearity is assumed.

1 Introduction

In the spirit of the construction of a field from its projective plane, Boris Zilber proposed an ambitious program: in model theory, the notion of algebraic closure in suitable first order structures gives rise to combinatorial geometries. These geometries can be very similar to projective spaces. Zilber conjectured that a strongly minimal structure interprets an infinite group, or even an infinite field, as soon as it fulfills some conditions, conditions that are clearly necessary [14]. This conjecture turned out to be false in general. However, together with Ehud Hrushovski they were able to establish that the conjecture holds for what they called "Zariski structures", first order structures with a topology which mimics the Zariski topology [8]. Ya'acov Peterzil and Sergei Starchenko proved a variant of the conjecture for the class of o-minimal structures [13]. O-minimal structures are linearly ordered structures, thus endowed with the topology defined by the ordering, and they present strong analogies with strongly minimal structures.

It is then natural to ask the question for C-minimal structures. The C-minimality condition is an equivalent of strong minimality in the setting of ultrametric structures (or more generally C-structures) just as o-minimality is an equivalent of strong minimality in the setting of ordered structures. However, the Steinitz exchange property which is a consequence of strong minimality and o-minimality, does not hold for all C-minimal structures. If we assume it, we are in the setting of *geometric structures* as defined by Ehud Hrushovski and Anand Pillay [7], since C-minimal structures do eliminate the quantifier $\exists^\infty$, the other required property. Geometric structures offer a common framework for strongly minimal or o-minimal structures as well as for many classical mathematical structures and provide tuned tools and techniques.

The second author had constructed an infinite definable group in any geometric C-minimal structure, which is non-trivial and locally modular ([9] and [10]). In this paper, we remove the assumption of local modularity. New arguments have to be blown into the proof and we follow the spirit of [13]. Some extra conditions are assumed, that appear in [3] and in the context of fields in [6]. They in particular guarantee the existence of limits of unary functions in the neighborhood of a point. This allows us to copy an essential element of [13]: the notion of "tangent". For a definable curve X and a definable family $\mathcal{F}$ of curves, where X and all the curves of $\mathcal{F}$ pass through some fixed point P, the idea is to determine a curve in $\mathcal{F}$ which, on a neighborhood of P, is closer to X than any other element of $\mathcal{F}$.

More precisely we show the following.

Theorem: *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a C-minimal structure which is definably maximal, geometric and non-trivial. Suppose moreover that in the underlying tree of $\mathcal{M}$ there is no definable bijection between a bounded interval and an unbounded one. Then there is an infinite group definable in $\mathcal{M}$.*

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to preliminaries on C-minimal structures. In Section 3, we show that either an infinite group or a family $\mathcal{F}$ of functions with *nice properties* is definable in $\mathcal{M}$. The idea is then to get a group law by composing the elements of this family of functions. As the composition is in general not in $\mathcal{F}$, we have to *approximate* it with a function from $\mathcal{F}$. For this end, we introduce in Sections 4 and 5 the notions of *tangents* and *derivatives*, and study their properties. We use them in Section 6 to construct an infinite group in $\mathcal{M}$.

2 Preliminaries

We start with a few definitions and preliminary results. C-structures and C-minimal structures have been introduced and studied in [5] and [11]. We remind in what follows their definition and principal properties.

Notations: We use $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}, ...$ to denote structures and $M, N, ...$ for their underlying sets.

In this paper, a C-structure is a structure $\mathcal{M} = (M, C, ...)$, where C is a ternary predicate satisfying the following axioms:

- $\forall x, y, z, C(x, y, z) \longrightarrow C(x, z, y)$
- $\forall x, y, z, C(x, y, z) \longrightarrow \neg C(y, x, z)$
- $\forall x, y, z, w, C(x, y, z) \longrightarrow [C(x, w, z) \vee C(w, y, z)]$
- $\forall x, y, x \neq y, \exists z \neq y, C(x, y, z)$.

Note that these C-structures are sometimes called "dense", see [4]. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a C-structure. We call *cone*[1] or *open ball* any subset of M of the form $\{x; \mathcal{M} \models C(a, x, b)\}$, where a and b are two distinct elements of $\mathcal{M}$. We call 0-*level set* or *closed ball* any subset of M of the form $\{x; \mathcal{M} \models \neg C(x, a, b)\}$, where a and b are two elements of $\mathcal{M}$. A set is said to be a *ball* if it is an open ball or a closed ball. It follows from the first three axioms of C-relations that the cones of M form a basis of a completely disconnected topology on M. The last axiom guarantees that all cones are infinite.

Let $(T, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set. We say that $(T, \leq)$ is a *tree* if the set of elements of T less than any fixed element is totally ordered by $\leq$, and if any two elements of T have a greatest lower bound. A *leaf* is a maximal element of T. A *branch* is a maximal totally ordered subset of T. It is easy to check that if a and b are two branches of T, then $sup(a \bigcap b)$ exists. On the set of branches of T, we define a ternary relation C in the following way: we say that $C(a, b, c)$ is true if and only if $\sup(a \bigcap b) < \sup(b \bigcap c)$. It is easy to check that this relation on the set of branches satisfies the first three axioms of a C-relation.

A theorem from [1] says that C-structures can be looked at as sets of branches of a tree, equipped with the C-relation as defined above. The construction of the *underlying tree* $T(\mathcal{M})$ of a C-structure $\mathcal{M}$ has been slightly modified in [4]. In this new construction, M can be identified with the set of leaves of $T(\mathcal{M})$. The tree $T(\mathcal{M})$ appears as the quotient of M^2 by an adequate equivalence relation which is definable in (M, C). To an element $x \in M$, we associate the branch $br_x := \{\nu \in T(\mathcal{M}) : \nu \leq x\}$. To elements $x, y \in M$, we associate the node $t := sup(x \cap y)$, where

[1] Note: M is not a cone.

x and y are seen as branches of $T(\mathcal{M})$. This operation is well defined, and we say then that x and y *branch at* t. If a and b are two distinct elements of M branching at a node ν, we denote $\Lambda_\nu(b) := \{x \in M; C(a,x,b)\}$, we call it *the cone of* b *at* ν, and we say that ν is its *basis*. For a node or a leaf ν of $T(\mathcal{M})$, we denote by Λ_ν the closed ball of M defined by ν. This corresponds to the set of all elements of M which contain ν when considered as branches of $T(\mathcal{M})$. We call ν *the basis of* Λ_ν.

For $a, b \in T(\mathcal{M}) \cup \{-\infty\}$ with $a < b$, the interval (a,b) is said to be *bounded from above* (respectively, *bounded from below*) if b is not a leaf (respectively, if $a \neq -\infty$).

Definition 1 *Let $\mathcal{M} = (M, C, ...)$ be a C-structure.*

1. *The structure $\mathcal{M}$ is* geometric *if for any structure $\mathcal{N}$ elementarily equivalent to $\mathcal{M}$, the algebraic closure in $\mathcal{N}$ has the exchange property. In this case, the algebraic closure is the closure operator of a pregeometry on $\mathcal{N}$. If this pregeometry is trivial on any $\mathcal{N}$ (i.e.* $\operatorname{acl} A = \bigcup\{\operatorname{acl} a; a$ *a singleton in* $A\}$ *for any* $A \subset N$*), then $\mathcal{M}$ is said to be* trivial. *See [7] and [12].*

2. *The structure $\mathcal{M}$ is* definably maximal *if any definable family of cones which is linearly ordered by the inclusion has a non-empty intersection.*

3. *The structure $\mathcal{M}$ is* C-minimal *if and only if for any structure $\mathcal{N} = (N, C, ...)$ elementarily equivalent to $\mathcal{M}$, any definable subset of N can be defined without quantifiers using only the relations C and $=$.*

Two comments on these definitions.
1. Geometric structures are provided with notions of independence, dimension, and generic points. In other respects C-minimal structures admit a cellular decompositions (see [5] and its complement [2]), which gives rise to a topological dimension. In geometric C-minimal structures, these two dimensions coincide. This means that a point is generic exactly when any definable set containing it contains a box of the ambient space.
2. Let us define a linearly ordered structure to be definably maximal if any definable decreasing family of bounded closed intervals has a non-empty intersection. Then any o-minimal structure is definably maximal. But not any C-minimal structure is definably maximal [3], nor geometric [5].

Proposition 2.1 *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a geometric C-minimal structure and T its underlying tree. Let $f : M \longrightarrow T \setminus M$ be a definable partial function. Then* $\operatorname{dom}(f)$ *can be written as a definable union $F \cup K$ such that F is finite, and f is locally constant on K.*

Proof: This is a direct consequence of Propositions 3.9 and 6.1 of [5]. □

Lemma 2.2 *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a geometric C-minimal structure, φ a formula in two variables over $\mathcal{M}$ and $b \in M$ generic over the parameters defining φ. Let D be a cone containing b and suppose that for all $u \in D$ there is a subcone V_u of D containing u such that for all $v \in V_u$, $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(u,v)$. Then there exists a neighborhood D' of b such that for all $u, v \in D'$, $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(u,v)$.*

Proof: For $u \in D$, let $f(u)$ be the node on the branch br_u of u such that

$$f(u) = \min\{\inf\{\nu \in br_u; \forall v \in \Lambda_\nu : \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(u,v)\}, \text{basis of } D\}.$$

The function $f : M \to T(\mathcal{M})$ is definable and the hypotheses on φ imply $f(D) \subset T(\mathcal{M}) \setminus M$, so by Proposition 2.1, $\operatorname{dom}(f)$ can be written as a definable union $F \cup K$ such that F is finite, and f is locally constant on K. By genericity, $b \notin F$. Thus there is a cone $D' \subset D$ containing b on which f is constant. Therefore, for any $u, v \in D'$, the formula $\varphi(u,v)$ is satisfied in $\mathcal{M}$. □

Lemma 2.3 *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a C-minimal structure, $c \in M$ and $\varphi(i,x)$ a formula in two variables on $\mathcal{M}$ where i ranges in the sort $T(\mathcal{M})$ in an interval $I =]\rho, c[$ of the branch of c, and x ranges in a cone $U \subset M$. We suppose that, for any $x, y \in M$, there is no definable bijection between a bounded interval of the branch of x and an unbounded interval of the branch of y. Suppose that*

$$\forall x \in U, \exists i \in I, \forall j \in I \ [j \geq i \rightarrow \varphi(j,x)].$$

Then

$$\exists i \in I, \forall x \in U, \forall j \in I \ [j \geq i \rightarrow \varphi(j,x)].$$

Proof: For $i \in I$, let U_i be the subset of elements $x \in U$ such that $\forall j \in I \ [j \geq i \rightarrow \varphi(j,x)]$. The map $i \mapsto U_i$ is increasing, and the union of all the U_i contains U. Then for every ball $\Lambda_\nu \subsetneq U$, Λ_ν is strictly contained in the union of the U_i, which is an increasing and definable family of definable subsets of M. By C-minimality the U_i are (uniformly definable) Swiss Cheese and Λ_ν must be contained in one of them. For every ν let i_ν be the infimum of the $i \in br_c$ with this property. Fix a node ν_0 such that $\Lambda_{\nu_0} \subset U$ and consider the function f which to a node between the basis of U and ν_0 associates the element i_ν. The branches equipped with the structure induced by $\mathcal{M}$ are o-minimal, thus there is a finite definable partition of the domain of f such that on each piece f is either constant or bijective monotonous. Consequently, since the domain of f is bounded, its image must be bounded from above by some $i_0 \in br_c$. By the choice of i_0 we have $\forall x \in U, \forall j \in I \ [j \geq i_0 \rightarrow \varphi(j,x)]$. □

Corollary 2.4 *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a C-minimal structure with no definable bijection between a bounded interval and an unbounded interval of $T(\mathcal{M})$. Let $\{D(\mu) : \mu \in I\}$ be a family of uniformly definable subsets of M, indexed by an interval I of $T(\mathcal{M})$, $I =]\rho, c[$ for some $c \in M, \rho \in br_c$, and such that*
- $\nu < \mu$ implies $D(\nu) \subset D(\mu)$
- $\bigcup_{\nu \in I} D(\nu)$ is a cone Γ in M.
Then $D(\nu_0) = \Gamma$ for some $\nu_0 \in I$.

3 Nice families of functions.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a C-minimal structure.

Lemma 3.1 *Let V be a cone in M, e an element of V, and $f, g, h : V \rightarrow M$ definable functions. Then there is a neighborhood W of e such that either any element $x \in W \setminus \{e\}$ satisfies $C(f(x), g(x), h(x))$, or any element $x \in W \setminus \{e\}$ satisfies $\neg C(f(x), g(x), h(x))$.*

Proof: Let $D \subset M$ be the set of elements x of V such that $C(f(x), g(x), h(x))$ holds. Either e is an accumulation point of D, in which case by C-minimality there is a neighborhood W of e such that $W \setminus \{e\} \subset D$, or e is an accumulation point of the complement $\neg D$ of D, in which case there is a neighborhood W of e such that $W \setminus \{e\} \subset \neg D$. □

Notation:

1. Let $x, y, z \in M$. We denote by $\Delta(x,y,z)$ the property
$$\neg C(x,y,z) \wedge \neg C(y,x,z).$$
2. Let $V \subset M$ be a cone, e an element of V, and f, g, h functions from V to M. We denote by $C_e(f,g,h)$ (or $C(f,g,h)$ if there is no confusion on e) the following property: there exists a neighborhood W of e such that
$$\forall x \in W \setminus \{e\} : C(f(x), g(x), h(x)).$$
We define $(\neg C)_e(f,g,h)$ and $\Delta_e(f,g,h)$ in the same way, and we denote them by $(\neg C)(f,g,h)$ and $\Delta(f,g,h)$ respectively, if there is no confusion on e.

Definition 2 *Let V be a cone in $\mathcal{M}$, $e \in V$, and $f : V \to M$ a definable function.*

1. *The function f is said to be* dilating on a neighborhood of e, *or just* dilating *if there is no confusion, if it satisfies $C_e(f \circ f, f, id_V)$.*
2. *The function f is said to be* non-dilating on a neighborhood of e, *or just* non-dilating *if there is no confusion, if it satisfies $(\neg C)_e(f \circ f, f, id_V)$.*

Definition 3 *Let $V \subset M$ be a cone and $\mathcal{F} = \{f_u : u \in U\}$ a definable family of definable functions from V to M, indexed by a cone $U \subset M$. The family $\mathcal{F}$ is said to be* a nice family of functions *if there is an element $e \in V$ with the following properties:*

1. *All the f_u are C-automorphisms of the cone V.*
2. *For every $u \in U$, we have $f_u(e) = e$.*
3. *For any fixed $x \in V \setminus \{e\}$, the application $U \longrightarrow V$ which to u associates $f_u(x)$, is a C-isomorphism from U onto some subcone of V.* $(*)$

A nice family $\mathcal{F}$ of functions is said to have an identity element *if for some $u_0 \in U$, $f_{u_0} = id_V$.*

Notation: If $\mathcal{F}$ is a nice family of functions, possibly with identity, then U, V, e and u_0 will be as in Definition 3 if there is no other precision. For a set W containing e, the set $W \setminus \{e\}$ will be denoted by W^*.

Terminology: For a nice family of functions $\mathcal{F}$, the sets U and V are called respectively the *index set* and the *domain*, and e is called the *absorbing element*.

Proposition 3.2 *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a non trivial geometric C-minimal structure. Suppose furthermore that in the underlying tree of $\mathcal{M}$ there is no definable bijection between a bounded interval and an unbounded one. Then either an infinite group or a nice family of non-dilating functions with identity is definable in $\mathcal{M}$.*

Proof: Without loss of generality, we can suppose that $\mathcal{M}$ is $\aleph_1$-saturated. By Proposition 15 and Lemma 21 of [9], we can find cones U_1, V_1 in M and a definable family of functions $\mathcal{H} = \{h_u : u \in U_1\}$ of (continuous) C-automorphisms of V_1 satisfying $(**)$: for every $x \in V_1$ the map $v \mapsto h_v(x)$ is a continuous C-isomorphism from U_1 onto some cone. Fix a generic triplet $(a, b, e) \in U_1 \times U_1 \times V_1$, and let $e' := h_a \circ h_b(e)$. By $(**)$, for any $v \in U_1$ there is at most one $z \in U_1$ such that $h_z \circ h_v(e) = e'$. When such a z exists, define $\theta(v) := z$. By $(**)$ again and the genericity of b, the function θ is well defined on some cone U_2 containing b.

Assume first that for all neighborhoods U_a, U_b of a, b there are $u \in U_a, u \neq a$ and $v \in U_b, v \neq b$ such that $h_u \circ h_v$ and $h_a \circ h_b$ coincide on some neighborhood of e as soon as they agree on e.

Claim. Under this assumption there are cones U_a, U_b and V containing a, b and e respectively, such that for all $(u, v), (u', v') \in U_a \times U_b$, $h_u \circ h_v$ and $h_{u'} \circ h_{v'}$ coincide on V as soon they agree on e.

Proof. Take a cone $U_3 \subset U_1$ containing b such that all $v \in U_3 \setminus \{b\}$ have the same type on (a, b, e). Necessarily $U_3 \subset U_2$. This implies that, for any $v \in U_3$ there is $u \in U_1$ such that $h_u \circ h_v(e) = e'$, but then $u = \theta(v)$. So it follows from our assumption that for all $v \in U_3$, $h_{\theta(v)} \circ h_v$ and $h_a \circ h_b$ have the same germ on e. Define $U'_b = U_3$ and $U'_a = \theta(U'_b)$. For any $(u, v) \in U'_a \times U'_b$ there is some neighborhood W of e such that $h_u \circ h_v$ and $h_a \circ h_b$ coincide on W as soon as they agree on e.
Let φ be the formula defined as follows: $\varphi(u, v, \nu) :\longleftrightarrow$ "$h_u \circ h_v$ and $h_a \circ h_b$ coincide on $\Lambda_\nu(e)$ as soon as they agree on e". We first fix $u \in U'_a$ and apply Lemma 2.3 to get ν_u such that for all $v \in U'_b$, $h_u \circ h_v$ and $h_a \circ h_b$ coincide on $\Lambda_{\nu_u}(e)$ as soon as they agree on e. We apply Lemma 2.3 again to get a cone V containing e which satisfies the following: for all $(u, v) \in U'_a \times U'_b$, $h_u \circ h_v$

and $h_a \circ h_b$ coincide on V as soon as they agree on e. We can define V with parameters, say c, independent over (a, b, e). Thus there are cones U_a and U_b containing respectively a and b such that any point in $U_a \times U_b$ has same type as (a, b) over (c, e). Therefore, for all $(u, v), (u', v') \in U_a \times U_b$, $h_u \circ h_v$ and $h_{u'} \circ h_{v'}$ coincide on V as soon they agree on e. $\dashv$

In this first case, we construct first an infinite C-group G type-definable in $\mathcal{M}$. For this end, we proceed exactly as in the proof of Theorem 19 of [9], applying the above claim instead of Lemma 22 of [9]. Indeed the local modularity was only used for proving Lemma 22. Then Theorem 1 of [10] gives us an infinite subgroup of G definable in $\mathcal{M}$.

Assume now that we are not in the above case. By C-minimality, there are cones U_a, U_b containing respectively a, b such that, for all $u \in U_a, u \neq a$ and $v \in U_b, v \neq b$ with $h_u \circ h_v(e) = e'$, the graphs of $h_u \circ h_v$ and $h_a \circ h_b$ do not intersect on W^* for some cone $W \ni e$. We can suppose without loss of generality that $U_b \subset U_2$. For $u \in U_2$, define $g_u := h_{\theta(u)} \circ h_u$.

The element b has the following property: there is a cone $U \ni b$ (for example $U = U_b$) such that for all $u \in U \setminus \{b\}$, the graphs of g_u and g_b do not intersect on W^* for some cone $W \ni e$. By genericity, this property holds on some cone $U_3 \subset U_b$ containing b. Hence we have the following: for all $v \in U_3$, there is a cone $U_v \ni v$ such that for all $u \in U_v \setminus \{v\}$, the graphs of g_u and g_v do not intersect on W^* for some cone $W \ni e$. By Lemma 2.2, there is some cone $U_4 \subset U_3$ containing b such that for any $u, v \in U_4$, $u \neq v$, there is some $W \ni e$ such that the functions g_u and g_v agree on exactly one point of W, namely e.

For $\nu \in br_e$ and $v \in U_4$, we define

$$D(\nu, v) := \{v\} \cup \{u \in U_4 : \mathrm{Gr}(g_v) \cap \mathrm{Gr}(g_u) \cap [\Lambda_\nu(e)^* \times M] = \emptyset\},$$

where $\mathrm{Gr}(g_u)$ and $\mathrm{Gr}(g_v)$ are the graphs of g_u and g_v respectively. By the choice of U_4 and Corollary 2.4, for all $v \in U_4$, $U_4 = D(\zeta(v), v)$ for some $\zeta(v) \in br_e$. This means that for all $v \in U_4$, any element of the family $\{g_u|\Lambda_{\zeta(v)}; u \in U_4 \setminus \{v\}\}$ agrees with g_v only on e. It follows by Lemma 2.3 that there is some $\zeta \in br_e$ such that $\forall u, v \in U_4$, $u \neq v$, the functions $g_u|\Lambda_\zeta(e)$ and $g_v|\Lambda_\zeta(e)$ agree only on e. Replace V_1 by $V := \Lambda_\zeta(e)$.

For every $x \in V^*$, the (definable) function from U_4 to V which to u associates $g_u(x)$ is now injective, thus a C-isomorphism on some neighborhood of b (since all points in V are independent of b) which we can suppose uniformly definable in x: by C-minimality the union of all cones for which this is true, is a cone, call it $J(x)$. For $\nu \in br_b$ define

$$X(\nu) := \{x \in V : \Lambda_\nu \subset J(x)\}.$$

By Corollary 2.4 there is a node ν_0 on the branch of b such that $X(\nu_0) = V$. We replace U_4 by the cone of b at ν_0, which we call U_5. The family of functions $g_v : V \longrightarrow M$, $v \in U_5$ has the property $(*)$.

Fix a generic element $u_0 \in U_5$, and let U_6 be a subcone of U_5 containing u_0 such that $\forall u \in U_6$, $g_{u_0}(V) = g_u(V)$. For $u \in U_6$, let f_u be the C-automorphism of V defined by $f_u := g_{u_0}^{-1} \circ g_u$. The family $\mathcal{F} := \{f_u : u \in U_6\}$ is a nice family of functions.

By C-minimality, there is a neighborhood U of u_0 such that, either for all $u \in U \setminus \{u_0\}$, the function f_u is non-dilating, or for all $u \in U \setminus \{u_0\}$, the function f_u is dilating. Suppose the f_u are dilating. This means that $C_e((g_{u_0}^{-1} \circ g_u)^2, g_{u_0}^{-1} \circ g_u, id_V)$ holds for any $u \in U$, $u \neq u_0$. Define $D_u := \{v \in U : C_e((g_u^{-1} \circ g_v)^2, g_u^{-1} \circ g_v, id_V)\}$ for $u \in U$. By genericity of u_0, for any u close enough to u_0, $u \neq u_0$, D_u contains $V_u \setminus \{u\}$ for some cone $V_u \ni u$. Thus the function $U \to T(M) \setminus M$, $u \mapsto \inf\{\text{basis of } \Gamma; \Gamma \text{ a cone}, \Gamma \setminus \{u\} \subset D_u, u \in \Gamma\}$, is well defined in the neighborhood of u_0. It must be locally constant. So we can find two elements u, v such that $u \in D_v$ and $v \in D_u$. It follows that

$$C_e(g_u^{-1} \circ g_v, id_V, (g_u^{-1} \circ g_v)^{-1}),$$

and

$$C_e((g_u^{-1} \circ g_v)^{-1}, id_V, g_u^{-1} \circ g_v).$$

Contradiction. □

4 Tangents: existence and uniqueness

Definition 4 *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a nice family of functions and $g : V \longrightarrow V$ a function such that $g(e) = e$.*

1. *Let u be an element of U. The function f_u is said to be* tangent to g relatively to the family $\mathcal{F}$ *if for any $u' \in U$, we have $(\neg C)(f_u, f_{u'}, g)$, in which case we write $f_u \sim_{\mathcal{F}} g$, or just $f_u \sim g$ if there is no confusion on $\mathcal{F}$.*

2. *The function g is said to be* derivable relatively to the family $\mathcal{F}$ *if there is a unique function $f_u \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $f_u \sim g$. In this case, f_u is called* the tangent to g in $\mathcal{F}$.

Notation: We fix a nice family $\mathcal{F}$ of functions, and a definable function $g : V \to V$ such that $g(e) = e$. We define

$$T_g := \{u \in U; f_u \sim g\},$$

and for $u \in U$,

$$\Gamma_{g,u} := \{y \in U : C(f_u, f_y, g)\}.$$

Lemma 4.1 *$\Gamma_{g,u} = \emptyset$ if and only if $u \in T_g$.*

Proof: Fix elements u and v of U. So either $(\neg C)(f_u, f_v, g)$, or $C(f_u, f_v, g)$. By the definition of tangent, $u \in T_g$ if and only if we are in the first case for every $v \in U$, if and only if $\Gamma_{g,u} = \emptyset$. □

Lemma 4.2 *1. Let u and v be elements of T_g. Then $\Lambda_{u\wedge v} \subset T_g$. Furthermore, there is a cone $W \subset V$ containing e such that*

$$\forall z \in \Lambda_{u\wedge v}\ \forall x \in W : \Delta(f_u(x), f_z(x), g(x)).$$

2. Let $u \in T_g$ and $v \in U \setminus T_g$. Then the cone Γ of v at $u \wedge v$ is contained in $U \setminus T_g$. Furthermore, there is a cone $W \subset V$ containing e such that

$$\forall z \in \Gamma, \forall x \in W^* : C(f_z(x), f_u(x), g(x)).$$

3. If T_g is not empty, then it is a ball.

Proof: 1. Let u, v be two distinct elements of T_g, and let W be a neighborhood of e such that,

$$\forall x \in W : \Delta(f_u(x), f_v(x), g(x)).$$

Let $w \in \Lambda_{u\wedge v}$, so we have $\neg C(w, u, v)$. By $(*)$, we have that

$$\forall x \in W : \neg C(f_w(x), f_u(x), f_v(x)).$$

So $\neg C(f_w(x), f_u(x), g(x))$ holds for all $x \in W$, and it follows that $w \in T_g$. For the second assertion, let z be an element of $\Lambda_{u\wedge v} \subset T_g$. Let

$$W_z := \bigcup \{W : W \text{ is a cone}, e \in W \subset V, \forall x \in W : \Delta(f_u(x), f_z(x), g(x))\}.$$

W_z is a non empty union of nested cones, so by C-minimality it is a cone. Let ν_z be its basis. If $z' \in U$ is such that $C(u, z', z)$, then ($z' \in T_g$ and) $\nu_z = \nu_{z'}$. Thus the application $z \mapsto \nu_z$ induces an application from the set of cones at $u \wedge v$ to the branch of e. As this set of cones equipped

with the structure induced by $\mathcal{M}$ is strongly minimal and br_e linearly ordered, the image of this application is finite. Let ν be the maximal element of the image. So we have

$$\forall z \in \Lambda_{u\wedge v}, \forall x \in \Lambda_\nu : \Delta(f_u(x), f_z(x), g(x)).$$

2. Similar proof.

3. By *1*, either T_g is empty, or it is a union of nested closed balls. It is then a cone or a closed ball by C-minimality. □

Lemma 4.3 *Let u, u', v, v' be elements of U such that $v \in \Gamma_{g,u}$ and $v' \in \Gamma_{g,u'}$. If v is not an element of $\Gamma_{g,u'}$, then v' is an element of $\Gamma_{g,u}$.*

Proof: Let u, v, u', v' be elements of U such that $v \in \Gamma_{g,u}$, $v' \in \Gamma_{g,u'}$ and $v \notin \Gamma_{g,u'}$. Let $W \subset V$ be a neighborhood of e such that, for every $x \in W^*$, we have $C(f_u(x), f_v(x), g(x))$, $C(f_{u'}(x), f_{v'}(x), g(x))$ and $\neg C(f_{u'}(x), f_v(x), g(x))$. By the first and third relations, we have

$$\forall x \in W^* : C(f_u(x), f_{u'}(x), g(x)).$$

This together with the second relation yields

$$\forall x \in W^* : C(f_u(x), f_{v'}(x), g(x)).$$

So v' is an element of $\Gamma_{g,u}$. □

Lemma 4.4 *If $\Gamma_{g,u}$ is not empty, then it is a cone at a node on the branch of u. For a fixed g, the non empty $\Gamma_{g,u}$ form a chain of cones.*

Proof: If x and y are elements of $\Gamma_{g,u}$, then $\Lambda_{x\wedge y} \subset \Gamma_{g,u}$. So $\Gamma_{g,u}$ is a union of nested closed balls and, by C-minimality, it is a ball. Fix an element $v \in \Gamma_{g,u}$. It is easy to see that $\Gamma_{g,u}$ contains the cone of v at $u \wedge v$, so $\Gamma_{g,u}$ is a ball at a node ν on the branch of u. But it is clear that $u \notin \Gamma_{g,u}$. Thus $\nu = u \wedge v$ and $\Gamma_{g,u}$ is the cone of v at the node $u \wedge v$.
The claim that the non empty $\Gamma_{g,u}$ form a chain of cones follows directly from Lemma 4.3 and the fact that in C-structures, two cones have a nonempty intersection if and only if one of these cones is contained in the other one. □

Lemma 4.5 *There is an element $u \in U$ such that $f_u \sim g$.*

Proof: If T_g is empty, then by Lemma 4.1, no cone $\Gamma_{g,u}$ is empty. By Lemma 4.4, the $\Gamma_{g,u}$ form a chain of cones of U. By definable maximality, their intersection is not empty. But this intersection is contained in T_g, which is a contradiction. □

Lemma 4.6 *1. There is a cone W containing e such that $\Delta(f_u(x), f_v(x), g(x))$ holds for all $u, v \in T_g$ and all $x \in W$.*

2. Suppose that T_g contains more than one element, and let $u \in T_g$. Then there is a cone W containing e such that $C(f_z(x), f_u(x), g(x))$ holds for all $z \in U \setminus T_g$ and all $x \in W^*$.

Proof: (i). By C-minimality and the definition of T_g, for all $u, v \in T_g$ there is some cone $W_{u,v}$ containing e such that $\Delta(f_u(x), f_v(x), g(x))$ holds for all $x \in W_{u,v}$. Fixing u and applying Lemma 2.3 to the formula $\varphi(i, v) =$ "$\Delta(f_u(x), f_v(x), g(x))$ *holds for all* $x \in \Lambda_i(e)$" gives for all u, a cone W_u containing e such that $\Delta(f_u(x), f_v(x), g(x))$ holds for all $v \in T_g$ and all $x \in W_u$. Applying Lemma 2.3 again gives the wanted result.

(ii). Suppose that T_g is a ball containing at least two elements, and let $c_0 := \inf T_g$. Fix an element $a \in T_g$ and a cone W containing e such that $\Delta(f_a(x), f_z(x), g(x))$ holds for all $z \in T_g$ and all $x \in W$. For any node $c \leq c_0$ and any element $z \in U \setminus T_g$ such that $z \wedge a = c$, there is a maximal ball $W_{c,z} \subset W$ such that

$$\forall x \in W^*_{c,z} : C(f_z(x), f_a(x), g(x)).$$

It is also easy to check that

$$\forall x \in W^*_{c,z} : C(f_{z'}(x), f_a(x), g(x))$$

for every $z' \in U$ such that $C(a, z, z')$. Since $W_{c,z} \subset W$, we have

$$\forall v \in T_g, \forall x \in W^*_{c,z} : \Delta(f_v(x), f_a(x), g(x)) \wedge C(f_{z'}(x), f_a(x), g(x))$$

for every z' such that $C(a, z, z')$. Let $\nu_{c,z}$ be the basis of $W_{c,z}$. So the application $z \mapsto \nu_{c,z}$ induces an application from the set of cones at c not containing T_g to the branch of e. By strong minimality of this set of cones, the image of this application is finite. Let ν_c be the maximal element of the image. Now the application which to c associates ν_c is an application from a bounded interval of the tree (namely the interval delimited by the basis of U and that of T_g) to the branch of e. Its image is then bounded from above by some node d. If $W_0 \subset W$ is the cone of e at d, then we have

$$\forall u, v \in T_g, \forall z \in U \setminus T_g, \forall x \in W^*_0 : \Delta(f_v(x), f_u(x), g(x)) \wedge C(f_z(x), f_u(x), g(x)).$$

□

Proposition 4.7 *The following are equivalent:*

1. *there are elements $u, v \in U$ such that $C(f_u, f_v, g)$;*
2. *$T_g \neq U$;*
3. *g is derivable relatively to the family $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof: We show that (iii) follows from (i), the rest (namely (iii) ⇒ (ii) ⇒ (i)) is trivial. Let u, v be like in the statement of (i). We know that T_g is not empty. Suppose that it contains two distinct elements. By Lemma 4.2(iii), T_g is a cone or a closed ball. By Lemma 4.6, there is a cone W containing e such that

$$\forall \alpha \in T_g, \forall z \in U, \forall x \in W : \neg C(f_\alpha(x), f_z(x), g(x)). \qquad (a)$$

Restricting W if necessary, we can suppose that

$$\forall x \in W^* : C(f_u(x), f_v(x), g(x)).$$

Fix an element $x_0 \in W^*$. By $(*)$, there is an element $w \in U$ such that $f_w(x_0) = g(x_0)$. Since T_g contains more than one element, choose an element $\alpha \neq w$, $\alpha \in T_g$. So we have $C(f_\alpha(x_0), f_w(x_0), g(x_0))$. This contradicts (a). □

5 Derivability relative to nice families of functions

We fix a nice family $\mathcal{F}$ of functions.

Lemma 5.1 *Let $g : V \longrightarrow V$ be a function such that $g(e) = e$. Suppose that g is derivable relatively to the family $\mathcal{F}$, and let f_{u_1} be its tangent. Then for every $u \in U, u \neq u_1$, we have $C(f_u, f_{u_1}, g)$.*

Proof: Follows directly from Lemma 3.1 and the definition of derivability. □

For $x \in V^*$, the function $\phi_{\mathcal{F},x} : U \to V, u \mapsto f_u(x)$, is a C-isomorphism from U onto some cone $\phi_{\mathcal{F},x}(U)$.

Let $g : V \longrightarrow V$ be a function such that $g(e) = e$. We define the map $\psi_{\mathcal{F},g} : V^* \to U, x \mapsto \phi^{-1}_{\mathcal{F},x}(g(x))$. So $\psi_{\mathcal{F},g}(x)$ is the unique element u of U such that $f_u(x) = g(x)$, when such an element exists.

Lemma 5.2 *If g is derivable relatively to the family $\mathcal{F}$, then $\psi_{\mathcal{F},g}$ is defined on W^* for some neighborhood $W \subset V$ of e.*

Proof: Let f_{u_1} be the tangent to g in $\mathcal{F}$, and let $u \neq u_1$ be an element of U. By Lemma 5.1, we have $C(f_u, f_{u_1}, g)$. So for some neighborhood $W \subset V$ of e, we have

$$\forall x \in W^* : C(f_u(x), f_{u_1}(x), g(x)).$$

For every $x \in W$, $f_u(x)$ and $f_{u_1}(x)$ are elements of the cone $\phi_{\mathcal{F},x}(U)$, so the same holds for $g(x)$. Hence $\psi_{\mathcal{F},g}$ is defined on W^*. □

Proposition 5.3 *If g is derivable relatively to $\mathcal{F}$, then $f_{u_1} \sim g$ if and only if*

$$\lim_{x \to e} \psi_{\mathcal{F},g}(x) = u_1.$$

Proof: By Lemma 5.2 $\psi_{\mathcal{F},g}$ is defined on W_0^* for some neighborhood W_0 of e. For every $x \in W_0$, we have that $f_{\psi_{\mathcal{F},g}(x)}(x) = g(x)$. Fix an element $u \in U \setminus \{u_1\}$ and a neighborhood $W_1 \subset V$ of e such that

$$\forall x \in W_1^* : C(f_u(x), f_{u_1}(x), g(x)). \qquad (1)$$

From (1) and the property $(*)$ of $\mathcal{F}$, it follows that

$$C(u, u_1, \psi_{\mathcal{F},g}(x)).$$

This shows that the unique possible limit of $\psi_{\mathcal{F},g}$ at e is u_1. On the other hand, we know by definable maximality and Proposition 4.4 of [3] that $\psi_{\mathcal{F},g}$ has a limit at e. So we have that

$$\lim_{x \to e} \psi_{\mathcal{F},g}(x) = u_1.$$

□

Definition 5 *Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be two nice families of functions having same domain and absorbing element.*

1. *The family $\mathcal{G}$ is said to be* derivable relatively to *$\mathcal{F}$ if every element of $\mathcal{G}$ is derivable relatively to $\mathcal{F}$.*
2. *The families $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are said to be* comparable *if both are derivable relatively to each other.*

Notation: Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_u : u \in U\}$ and $\mathcal{G} = \{g_u : u \in U'\}$ be two nice families of functions. Suppose that the family $\mathcal{G}$ is derivable relatively to the family $\mathcal{F}$. We define the *derivative* and denote it by $\partial_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}}$ as the function

$$\begin{array}{rccl} \partial_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}} : & U' & \longrightarrow & U \\ & u' & \longmapsto & u \text{ such that } f_u \sim g_{u'}. \end{array}$$

Lemma 5.4 *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_u : u \in U\}$ and $\mathcal{G} = \{g_u : u \in U'\}$ be two nice families of functions. Suppose that the family $\mathcal{G}$ is derivable relatively to the family $\mathcal{F}$. Let a'_1, a'_2 and a'_3 be elements of U' such that $C(a'_1, a'_2, a'_3)$, and let $a_i := \partial_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}}(a'_i)$. Then either $C(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ or $a_1 = a_3$.*

Proof: Suppose for a contradiction that $\neg C(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ and $a_3 \neq a_1$ hold. Then $a_3 \neq a_2$. Let $W \subset V$ be a neighborhood of e such that, for every $x \in W^*$ we have

$$C(f_{a_3}(x), g_{a'_1}(x), f_{a_1}(x)) \ \wedge \ C(f_{a_3}(x), g_{a'_2}(x), f_{a_2}(x))$$

and

$$C(f_{a_1}(x), g_{a'_3}(x), f_{a_3}(x)) \ \wedge \ C(f_{a_2}(x), g_{a'_3}(x), f_{a_3}(x)).$$

Therefore, for every $x \in W$ holds:

$$\neg C(g_{a'_1}(x), g_{a'_2}(x), g_{a'_3}(x)).$$

By $(*)$ for $\mathcal{G}$ we have:

$$\neg C(a'_1, a'_2, a'_3),$$

contradiction. □

Corollary 5.5 *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_u : u \in U\}$ and $\mathcal{G} = \{g_u : u \in U'\}$ be two nice families of functions. Suppose that the family $\mathcal{G}$ is derivable relatively to the family $\mathcal{F}$. Then $\partial_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}}$ is continuous on U'.*

Proof: By definable maximality, Proposition 4.4 of [3] and Lemma 5.4, the function $\partial_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}}$ admits a limit in each point of U', and the limit is an element of U. Let $a' \in U'$ and $a := \partial_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}}(a')$. If the limit of $\partial_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}}$ in a' is an element $b \neq a$, then we can find elements $b'_1, b'_2 \in U'$ such that $C(b'_1, b'_2, a')$, and $C(a, b_i, b)$ for $i = 1, 2$, where $b_i = \partial_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}}(b'_i)$. Then $C(a, b_1, b_2)$, which contradicts Lemma 5.4.□

Proposition 5.6 *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_u : u \in U\}$ and $\mathcal{G} = \{g_u : u \in U'\}$ be two nice families of functions. Suppose moreover that $\mathcal{G}$ is derivable relatively to $\mathcal{F}$. Let a, a' be elements of U and U' respectively. Then $f_a \sim g_{a'}$ if and only if for any neighborhood $A \subset U$ of a, any neighborhood $A' \subset U'$ of a', and any neighborhood $E \subset V$ of e, there are elements $\alpha \in A, \alpha' \in A'$ and $y \in E^*$ such that $f_\alpha(y) = g_{\alpha'}(y)$.*

Proof: For the implication from left to right let $a \in U$, $a' \in U'$ and suppose that $f_a \sim g_{a'}$. By Lemma 5.3, we have that

$$\lim_{x \to e} \psi_{\mathcal{F},g_{a'}}(x) = a.$$

Let $A \subset U$, $A' \subset U'$ and $E \subset V$ be neighborhoods of a, a' and e respectively. We can find an element $y \in E^*$ such that $\psi_{\mathcal{F},g_{a'}}(y) \in A$. Set $\alpha := \psi_{\mathcal{F},g_{a'}}(y)$ and $\alpha' := a'$. We have then that $\alpha \in A$, $\alpha' \in A'$, $y \in E^*$, and by the definition of ψ we have

$$f_\alpha(y) = g_{\alpha'}(y).$$

For the converse, let $b \in U$ be such that $f_b \not\sim g_{a'}$, and let $a \neq b$ be an element of U such that $f_a \sim g_{a'}$. Let E_0 be a neighborhood of e such that

$$\forall x \in E_0^* : C(f_b(x), g_{a'}(x), f_a(x)). \qquad (1)$$

Let Γ be the cone of a at the node $a \wedge b$. The element $\partial_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}}(a') = a$ is an element of Γ, so by continuity of $\partial_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}}$, there is an element $a'_1 \in U' \setminus \{a'\}$ such that $a_1 := \partial_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}}(a'_1) \in \Gamma$. Let $E_1 \subset V$ be a neighborhood of e such that

$$\forall x \in E_1^* : C(f_b(x), g_{a'_1}(x), f_{a_1}(x)). \qquad (2)$$

Let A' be the cone of a' at the node $a' \wedge a'_1$, B be the cone of b at the node $a \wedge b$, and $E := E_0 \cap E_1$. By the properties of $\mathcal{F}$, we have

$$\forall \beta \in B, \forall x \in E^* : C(f_a(x), f_\beta(x), f_b(x)). \qquad (3)$$

By (1), (2) and the fact that $C(f_b(x), f_{a_1}(x), f_a(x))$ for any $x \neq e$, we have

$$\forall x \in E^* : C(f_b(x), g_{a'}(x), f_a(x)) \wedge C(f_b(x), g_{a'_1}(x), f_a(x)). \qquad (4)$$

Furthermore, by the properties of $\mathcal{G}$ we have:

$$\forall \alpha \in A', \forall x \in E^* : C(g_{a'_1}(x), g_\alpha(x), g_{a'}(x)). \qquad (5)$$

From (4) and (5) we have

$$\forall \alpha \in A', \forall x \in E^* : C(f_b(x), g_\alpha(x), f_a(x)). \qquad (6)$$

By (3) and (6), we have

$$\forall \beta \in B, \forall \alpha \in A', \forall x \in E^* : f_\beta(x) \neq g_\alpha(x),$$

and B, A' and E are neighborhoods of b, a' and e respectively. This completes the proof. □

An immediate consequence of Proposition 5.6 is the

Corollary 5.7 *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_u : u \in U\}$ and $\mathcal{G} = \{g_u : u \in U'\}$ be two comparable families of functions, and let a, a' be elements of U and U' respectively. Then $f_a \sim_{\mathcal{F}} g_{a'}$ if and only if $g_{a'} \sim_{\mathcal{G}} f_a$.*

Corollary 5.8 *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_u : u \in U\}$ and $\mathcal{G} = \{g_u : u \in U'\}$ be two comparable families of functions. Then $\partial_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}}$ and $\partial_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{F}}$ are inverse of each other, and they define (continuous) C-isomorphisms between U and U'.*

Proof: By Corollary 5.7, the functions $\partial_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}}$ and $\partial_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{F}}$ are inverse of each other, thus define bijections between U and U'. Continuity follows from Corollary 5.5, and the rest from Lemma 5.4. □

Example 1 *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an algebraically closed valued field with maximal ideal Υ, $U = U' := 1 + \Upsilon$, $V := \Upsilon$, $u_0 = u'_0 = 1$, $e = 0$, $\mathcal{F} := \{u.x; u \in U\}$ and $\mathcal{G} := \{x + (u-1).x^2; u \in U'\}$. Then $\mathcal{G}$ is derivable relatively to $\mathcal{F}$, and $\partial_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}}$ is constant and sends every u' to 1. Now $\partial_{\mathcal{G},\mathcal{F}}$ is defined only at the point 1, and its image in this point is 1.*

Proposition 5.9 *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_u : u \in U\}$ and $\mathcal{G} = \{g_u : u \in U'\}$ be nice comparable families of functions, and $h : V \longrightarrow V$ a function such that $h(e) = e$. Suppose that h is derivable relatively to $\mathcal{G}$. Then h is derivable relatively to $\mathcal{F}$. More precisely, if $f_a \sim_{\mathcal{F}} g_b \sim_{\mathcal{G}} h$, then $f_a \sim_{\mathcal{F}} h$.*

Proof: Let a, b be elements of U, U' respectively such that $f_a \sim_{\mathcal{F}} g_b$ and $g_b \sim_{\mathcal{G}} h$. Suppose first that $\neg C(h, f_a, g_b)$ holds. For any $a_1 \neq a$, we have $C(f_{a_1}, f_a, h)$, which implies $f_a \sim_{\mathcal{F}} h$.
Now suppose $C(h, f_a, g_b)$, and $\neg C(f_{a_1}, f_a, h)$ for some $a_1 \neq a$. For every $y \neq b$, we have $C(g_y, g_b, h)$, thus $C(g_y, f_{a_1}, g_b)$, and $g_b \sim_{\mathcal{G}} f_{a_1}$. From Corollary 5.7 follows $f_{a_1} \sim_{\mathcal{F}} g_b$, so $a_1 = a$. Contradiction. □

6 The group law

Given a nice family of functions $\mathcal{F} = \{f_u : u \in U\}$, and a C-automorphism g of V with $g(e) = e$, then $\{g \circ f_u : u \in U\}$ and $\{f_u \circ g : u \in U\}$ are nice families of functions.

Lemma 6.1 *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_u : u \in U\}$ be a nice family of non-dilating functions with identity f_{u_0}. Let g, h be two C-automorphisms of V with $g(e) = h(e) = e$. Assume that there is an element $c \in U$ such that $C(f_c, g, f_{u_0})$ and $C(f_c, h, f_{u_0})$. Then $C(f_c, g \circ h, f_{u_0})$ holds, and $g \circ h$ is derivable relatively to the family $\mathcal{F}$. If f_x is the derivative of $g \circ h$, then $C(c, x, u_0)$.*

Proof: We have $C(g \circ f_c, g \circ h, g)$ (a), $C(f_c \circ f_c, g \circ f_c, f_c)$ (b) and $\neg C(f_c \circ f_c, f_c, id_V)$ (c). From (b) and (c) follows $C(id_V, g \circ f_c, f_c)$ (d), which together with $C(f_c, g, id_V)$ yields $C(g \circ f_c, g, id_V)$. By (a) we have $C(g \circ f_c, g \circ h, id_V)$. This relation together with (d) yields $C(f_c, g \circ h, id_V)$. The derivability of $g \circ h$ relatively to the family $\mathcal{F}$ follows from Proposition 4.7, and it is clear that if f_x is the derivative of $g \circ h$, then $C(c, x, u_0)$. □

We fix a nice family of non-dilating functions $\mathcal{F}' := \{f_u : u \in U'\}$ with identity. Let $c \neq u_0$ be an element of U', and $U := \{x \in U' : C(c, x, u_0)\}$. Then the family $\mathcal{F} := \{f_u : u \in U\}$ is a nice family of non-dilating functions with identity.

Lemma 6.2 *Let $a \in U$. Then $C(f_c, f_a^{-1}, id_V)$.*

Proof: The relation $C(f_c, f_a, id_V)$ holds, so by composing with f_c we have $C(f_c \circ f_c, f_a \circ f_c, f_c)$. This together with the fact that f_c is not dilating yields

$$C(id_V, f_a \circ f_c, f_c). \qquad (*)$$

Now we have $C(f_c, f_a, id_V)$ and that f_a is not dilating. From this follows that

$$C(f_c, f_a \circ f_a, id_V). \qquad (**)$$

The relations $(*)$ and $(**)$ give $C(f_a \circ f_c, f_a \circ f_a, id_V)$. Composing with f_a^{-1} and using $C(f_c, f_a, id_V)$ gives the wanted result. □

Lemma 6.3 *Let a be an element of U. Then the nice families $\{f_a \circ f_u : u \in U\}$, $\{f_a^{-1} \circ f_u : u \in U\}$, $\{f_u \circ f_a : u \in U\}$ and $\{f_u \circ f_a^{-1} : u \in U\}$ are comparable with $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof: Let $u \in U$. By Lemma 6.1, $f_a \circ f_u$ is derivable relatively to $\mathcal{F}'$, with derivative f_x for some $x \in U'$. By the second part of Lemma 6.1, $x \in U$, thus $f_a \circ f_u$ is derivable relatively to $\mathcal{F}$. This shows that the family $\{f_a \circ f_u : u \in U\}$ is derivable relatively to $\mathcal{F}$.

The derivability of $f_a \circ f_u$ relatively to $\mathcal{F}$ implies also that f_u is derivable relatively to $\{f_a^{-1} \circ f_u; u \in U\}$. Lemma 6.2 yields $C(f_c, f_a^{-1}, id)$, so the previous argument applies to f_a^{-1} instead of f_a. This shows that $\mathcal{F}$, $\{f_a \circ f_u; u \in U\}$ and $\{f_a^{-1} \circ f_u; u \in U\}$ are comparable. That $\mathcal{F}$, $\{f_u \circ f_a; u \in U\}$ and $\{f_u \circ f_a^{-1}; u \in U\}$ are comparable can be proved in a similar way. □

Notations: If g is derivable relatively to $\mathcal{F}$, we denote by $\widehat{g}$ its tangent.

Definition 6 *Let $\hat{o} : \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F}$ be the operation defined by $f_u \hat{o} f_v := \widehat{f_u \circ f_v}$.*

By Lemma 6.3, ô is well defined. We will show now that $(\mathcal{F}, \hat{o}, f_{u_0})$ is a group (which is clearly infinite). This group structure can be obviously definably transferred on U.

Lemma 6.4 *The operation ô is regular.*

Proof: We show right regularity, left regularity can be done in a similar way. Suppose that $f_w = f_u \hat{\circ} f_a = f_v \hat{\circ} f_a$. So $f_w \sim f_u \circ f_a$, and $f_w \sim f_v \circ f_a$. Let $\mathcal{G} := \{f_x \circ f_a^{-1} : x \in U\}$. So $f_w \circ f_a^{-1} \sim_{\mathcal{G}} f_u$. By Corollary 5.7 we have $f_u \sim f_w \circ f_a^{-1}$. The same argument yields $f_v \sim f_w \circ f_a^{-1}$, and we have $f_u = f_v$. □

Lemma 6.5 *The operation* $\hat{\circ}$ *is associative.*

Proof: If g is such that $f_a \sim g$, then $f_a \circ f_v \sim_{\mathcal{G}} g \circ f_v$, where $\mathcal{G} := \{f_x \circ f_v : x \in U\}$. Furthermore, it follows from the definition of $\hat{\circ}$ that $f_a \hat{\circ} f_v \sim f_a \circ f_v$. So by Proposition 5.9, $f_a \hat{\circ} f_v \sim g \circ f_v$. The same is true when we compose with g from the right: $f_v \hat{\circ} f_a \sim f_v \circ g$. This means with our notations:

$$\widehat{g} \,\hat{\circ} f_v = \widehat{g \circ f_v}$$

and

$$f_v \hat{\circ}\, \widehat{g} = \widehat{f_v \circ g}.$$

This implies the following:

$$(f_a \hat{\circ} f_b) \hat{\circ} f_c = (\widehat{f_a \circ f_b}) \hat{\circ} f_c = \quad \widehat{(f_a \circ f_b) \circ f_c} \quad = \quad \widehat{f_a \circ f_b \circ f_c}$$

and

$$f_a \hat{\circ} (f_b \hat{\circ} f_c) = f_a \hat{\circ} (\widehat{f_b \circ f_c}) = \quad \widehat{f_a \circ (f_b \circ f_c)} \quad = \quad \widehat{f_a \circ f_b \circ f_c} \quad .$$

So $\hat{\circ}$ is associative. □

Lemma 6.6 *Every* $f_a \in \mathcal{F}$ *admits an inverse.*

Proof: Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the family $\{f_a \circ f_u : u \in U\}$. The families $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are comparable, so let $b \in U$ be such that $f_a \circ f_b \sim_{\mathcal{G}} f_{u_0}$. By Corollary 5.7 we have $f_{u_0} \sim f_a \circ f_b$, so $f_a \hat{\circ} f_b = f_{u_0}$, which is the identity element of $(\mathcal{F}, \hat{\circ})$. So f_a has a right inverse, and the same argument shows that f_a has a left inverse. □

We have proved the following

Proposition 6.7 *Let* $\mathcal{M}$ *be a definably maximal and non-trivial geometric* C*-minimal structure. Suppose moreover that in the underlying tree of* $\mathcal{M}$ *there is no definable bijection between a bounded interval and an unbounded one, and that a nice family of non-dilating functions with identity is definable in* $\mathcal{M}$*. Then there is an infinite group definable in* $\mathcal{M}$*.*

Propositions 3.2 and 6.7 yield directly the following Theorem.

Theorem 6.8 *Let* $\mathcal{M}$ *be a definably maximal and non-trivial geometric* C*-minimal structure. Suppose moreover that in the underlying tree of* $\mathcal{M}$ *there is no definable bijection between a bounded interval and an unbounded one. Then there is an infinite group definable in* $\mathcal{M}$*.*

acknowledgements: We are indebted to Bernhard Elsner for pointing out an error in the original proof of Proposition 3.2.

References

[1] S.A. Adeleke and P.M. Neumann, *Relations Related to Betweennes: Their Structure and Automorphisms*, American Mathematical Society (1998).

[2] P. Cubides-Kovacsics, *An introduction to C-minimal structures and their cell decomposition theorem*, In *Valuation theory and interaction*, Editors Antonio Campillo, Franz-Viktor Kuhlmann and Bernard Teissier, Series of Congress Reports of the EMS, American Mathematical Society (1998).

[3] F. Delon, *Corps C-minimaux en l'honneur de François Lucas*, Annales de la Faculté des Sciences de Toulouse XXI (2012), 201–222.

[4] F. Delon, *C-minimal structures without density assumption,* in *Motivic Integration and its Interactions with Model Theory and Non-Archimedean Geometry (Ed. Cluckers, Nicaise, Sebag)*, London Mathematical Society, Lecture Notes Series, 384, Vol II, 51–86.

[5] D. Haskell and D. Macpherson, *Cell Decompositions of C-minimal Structures*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 66 (1994), 113–162.

[6] E. Hrushovski and D. Kazhdan, *Integration in valued fields*, in Algebraic Geometry and Number Theory, Progr. Math. 253, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston (2006), 261-405.

[7] E. Hrushovski and A. Pillay, *Groups definable in local fields and pseudo-finite fields*, Israel Journal of Math. 85 (1994), 203-262.

[8] E. Hrushovski and B. Zilber, *Zariski geometries*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 9 (1996), 1–56.

[9] F. Maalouf, *Construction d'un groupe dans les structures C-minimales* J. Symbolic Logic 73 (2008), 957–968.

[10] F. Maalouf, *Type-definable groups in C-minimal structures* Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences - Mathématiques, 348 (2010): 709–712.

[11] D. Macpherson and C. Steinhorn, *On variants of o-minimality* Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 79 (1996), 165–209.

[12] D. Marker, *Model Theory: An Introduction* Graduate texts in math. 217, Springer (2000).

[13] Y. Peterzil and S. Starchenko, *A trichotomy theorem for o-minimal structures*, Proc. London Math. Society 77 (1998), 481-523.

[14] B. Zilber, *The structure of models of uncountably categorical theories*, Proc. Internat. Congr. Math. (Warsaw 1983), vol. 1, North-Holland, Amsterdam (1984), 359-368.

Françoise Delon, CNRS,
IMJ-PRG, UMR 7586,
Univ Paris Diderot, F-75013, Paris,
UFR de mathématiques, case 7012
75205 Paris Cedex 13
France
email: delon@math.univ-paris-diderot.fr

Fares Maalouf
Université St Joseph
ESIB
B.P. 11-514
Riad el Solh, Beirut 11072050
Lebanon
email:fares.maalouf@usj.edu.lb